


Rhode Island Family Care Community Partnerships CY10 4th Quarter and CY11 1st Quarter Data

I. Characteristics of Active Families


The Family Care Community Partnerships (FCCPs) had 1315 families active during the CY11 1st quarter (active defined as opened at least 1 day or greater during the quarter). This is a slight increase from the CY10 4th quarter which had 1198 active families. Figure 1 shows that the proportion of families in the respective FCCPs has changed very little over the six month period.

Figure 1: Percentage of Families Active by FCCP, CY10 4th Quarter & CY11 1st Quarter




Data Source: RI Family Information System (RIFIS)

Figure 2: Race of Target Child in FCCP, CY11 1st Quarter



Data Source: RIFIS. Note: Technical error occurred in ethnicity, data in “other” is predominantly Latino ethnicity


Figure 3 shows the median age of the child. The median age of the child remains consistent, age 8, with the exception of the West Bay region. Their median age increased slightly from 7 to 8 years old.

Figure 3: Median Age of Target Child, CY11 1st Quarter

Data Source: RIFIS

II. Wrap versus Non Wrap Practice Model: Percentage of Families in FCCP in Wrap, by Quarter

The largest proportion of active families experienced Non Wrap Practice model vs. Wrap Practice Model. However, the proportion of families in a Wrap Practice Model has increased since the inception of the FCCPs.

Figure 4: Percent of Families in FCCP by Practice Model, CY10 4th Quarter & CY11 1st Quarter


Data Source: RIFIS

¹ PEP: Positive Educational Partnership

III. Eligibility Criteria

The largest percentage of children entering the FCCP is those who are at risk for child abuse and neglect. Figure 5 shows percentage of eligibility criteria by practice model. The proportion of risk for child abuse and neglect in Non Wrap increased from CY10 4th Qtr to CY 1st Qtr.

Figure 5: Percent of FCCP Families by Eligibility Criteria by Practice Model, CY10 4th Quarter & CY11 1st Quarter



Data Source: RIFIS


FCCP Intake 1A was completed during January 1 to March 31, 2011. The numbers are not mutually exclusive because the end user can check all that apply.

IV. Response Priority: Response severity among families and face-to-face contact time by Quarter

The greatest proportion of active families was classified as “routine” rather than emergency or urgent within response priority (response severity). This trend has been consistent across quarters since the FCCP inception.

Figure 6 shows the percentage of families broken down by their respective response priority/category at the time of intake was:

Figure 6: Percent of FCCP Families by Response Priority, CY10 4th Quarter & CY11 1st Quarter




Data Source: RIFIS

Figure 7 displays data on the adherence to the FCCP standards for FCCP response time to make face-to-face with the family given their respective response priority is outlined below.

Each of the 3 DCYF severity-level response categories (Emergency, Urgent, and Routine) has a corresponding first face-to-face contact response time as defined in the FCCP Practice Standards.

Figure 7: Average & median length of time (days) to first face to face contact with family, CY10 4th Quarter & CY11 1st Quarter



Data Source: RIFIS

V. Median and Average Length of Time in FCCP

Table 1 displays data on the median and average length of time families who transitioned from the FCCP during CY11 1st Quarter. The data is based on date opened to the FCCP to FCCP close/transition.

Table 1: Median and Average Length of Time in the FCCP CY11 1st Quarter


	State (N=581)
Median:	127.0
Average:	158.8

Data Source: RIFIS. Based on number of closed cases during CY11 1st Quarter. The median length of time in this table is lower than the median length of time in figure 8 because children whose practice model was set to “pending” are included. Seventy seven cases had “pending” as their practice model and their median length of time in the FCCP was equal to 85 days.

VI. Length of Time in Practice Model by Quarter

The data compares the length of time a family is in their respective Practice Model (among closed families). The median length of time has decreased among Wrap families from 207 to 170 days. Among Non Wrap families, the time has increased from 130 to 150 days.

Figure 8: Practice Model by Median Length of Time in Practice Model, CY10 4th Quarter & CY11 1st Quarter



Data Source: RIFIS

Based on number of closed cases during CY10 4th Quarter CY11 1st Quarter and does not include children whose practice model was set to “pending.”

VII. FCCP Referral Source and Wrap Vs Non Wrap Practice Model by Quarter

The following data informs whether families referred by DCYF to the FCCP experience different practice model approaches compared to those families not directly referred by DCYF. In general, the distribution of Wrap and Non Wrap across the 5 referral sources remained relatively consistent. The gap has remained consistently larger between Wrap and Non Wrap for those referred through DCYF Indicated Investigations compared to the Wrap and Non Wrap gaps amongst the other referral sources (15.7 (38-22.3) absolute difference in CY 4th quarter and 12.5 (37.4-24.9) in CY 11 1st quarter).


Table 2: Percent of Top 5 FCCP Referral Sources by Practice Model, CY10 4th Quarter & CY11 1st Quarter

	CY10 4 th Quarter		CY11 1 st Quarter	
	Wrap	Non Wrap	Wrap	Non Wrap
DCYF: Indicated Investigation	22.3%	38.0%	24.9%	37.4%
DCYF: CPI Request for Services	12.6%	15.6%	11.0%	16.9%
DCYF: Intake ISR	7.2%	8.8%	4.3%	7.4%
School	15.8%	7.6%	17.4%	11.8%
Self Referral	14.6%	12.2%	13.1%	10.9%


Data Source: RIFIS

Figure 9: Percent of FCCP Referral Source by Practice Model, CY10 4th Quarter & CY11 1st Quarter


CY10 4th Qtr: Wrap





CY10 4th Qtr: Non Wrap



CY11 1st Qtr: Wrap



CY11 1st Qtr: Non Wrap




Data Source: RIFIS

³ All other: the remaining 19 referral sources combined as each of these 19 sources have very low percentages. These categories are collected separately and combined for this table only.

VIII. Families in Wrap vs. Non Wrap and their corresponding response priority by Quarter

The data is to help inform whether families with different response priorities receive different Practice Models (Wrap Practice vs. Non Wrap). The data below illustrate a higher proportion of families who are “routine” and not directly referred by DCYF are in Wrap compared to “routine CPS (DCYF)”.

Figure 10: Percent of Response Priority by Practice Model, CY10 4th Quarter & CY11 1st Quarter




Data Source: RIFIS

*Total will not equal 100% (excluded “pending” “blank”)

IX. Number of Wrap team meeting occurrences by Quarter

Wrap team meeting occurrences continue to be reportedly low. This low percentage is consistent with prior quarterly reports since the FCCP inception. Figure 11 shows the number of Wrap Team Meetings among Wrap families.

Figure 11: Number of FCCP Wrap Team Meetings among Wrap Families, CY10 4th Quarter & CY11 1st Quarter



Data Source: RIFIS

X. Outcomes

FCCP Close Reason – Differences by the Close Reason

To inform the exit reason outcomes, below is data on the FCCP close/transition reasons and if there are differences amongst the different referral sources. The FCCP close reasons for families closed during CY11 1st quarter (State: N= 581) is presented in Tables 3-5 and Figure 12.

Table 3: Top 10 FCCP close reasons, CY11 1st Quarter

FCCP Close Reason	State (N = 581)
FCCP Non Wrap completed	24.4%
Family withdrew without notice	16.4%
Team agrees Wrap completed	14.6%
Family declined service	8.8%
Unable to contact family	7.1%
Other	5.5%
Family moved out of area	3.8%
Family withdrew with notice	3.3%
Target child opened to DCYF and removed from home	3.3%
Transfer Target Child to another FCCP	2.2%

Data Source: RIFIS. Based on the number of closed cases during CY11 1st Quarter

Table 4 presents data on the top close reasons by referral source categories for CY11 1st Quarter. Amongst families referred by DCYF, excluding the Youth Development Center (YDC), the percent of families in the FCCP where the team agrees the Wrap or non Wrap was completed was 16.0% and 42.0% respectively while 23.7% withdrew without notice, 10.0% unable to reach and 8.2% family declined service.

Table 4: Percent of FCCP Top 5 close reasons by 4 referral source categories CY 11 1st Quarter

FCCP Close Reason	Referral Source				
	DCYF	YDC (DCYF)	Self-Referral	School	Other
Family declined service	8.2%	14.3%	23.7%	0.0%	14.2%
Family withdrew w/o notice	23.7%	21.4%	27.1%	50.0%	18.9%
FCCP Non Wrap completed	42.0%	32.1%	22.0%	50.0%	25.5%
Team agrees Wrap completed	16.0%	21.4%	16.9%	0.0%	32.1%
Unable to reach family	10.0%	10.7%	10.2%	0.0%	9.4%

Data Source: RIFIS. Based on the number of closed cases during CY11 1st Quarter

Table 5 presents data on cases with a close reason reportedly as “opened to DCYF”. The percent slightly increased in CY11 1st Qtr from CY10 4th Qtr.


Table 5: Percent of FCCP families with Close Reason reported as “Opened to DCYF”

	DCYF Referred to FCCP	
	CY10 4 th Quarter	CY11 1 st Quarter
Child opened to DCYF	5.9%	7.6%

Data Source: RIFIS. Based on the number of closed cases during CY10 4th Quarter and CY11 1st Quarter

Figure 12 looks at the close reasons by Wrap Practice Model vs. Non Wrap Practice Model. The percent of families completing Wrap and Non Wrap have increased from the CY10 4th quarter to CY11 1st quarter.

Figure 12: Percent of FCCP Top 5 close reasons by practice model, CY10 4th Quarter & CY11 1st Quarter



Data Source: RIFIS. "Unable to Contact Family" was added as a response choice in CY11 1st quarter.

XI. Functional Assessments

In addition to reasons for the family transition or closing as an outcome measure, functional assessments such as the North Carolina Family Assessment, among others, inform as to whether the family has made family functional improvement as it relates to the practice model approach.

The completion of the NCFAS is low and is consistent with the trends observed since the inception of the FCCPs. Approximately 30% of the 352 children who closed/transitioned in CY11 1st quarter and were open for greater than 30 days had a baseline and transition NCFAS. The low numbers create barriers for analysis.

The FCCP standards for completing a baseline NCFAS is 30 days.

Table 6: Average Number of days for NCFAS completion by Region, CY10 4th Quarter & CY11 1st Quarter

	CY10 4 th & CY11 1 st Qtrs
Average number of days to complete NCFAS baseline	37.6

Data Source: RIFIS